

REMARKS

Response to previous amendment

The applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's entry of the amended abstract.

Amendments

The applicant respectfully amends claims 1-6 as indicated above, and adds a new claim 7.

Section 103 rejection

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 6 as rendered obvious by *Ichihara* (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,937) in light of *Arlein et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,656). In response to the Examiner's rejection, the applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6.

As amended, independent claim 1 requires

replacing said stored new password hash value with said new password hash value, such that said user is disabled from logging on to said database.

As best understood, the Examiner considered "replacing said stored new password hash value with said new password hash value" to correspond to storing a new password from the password storage section in the password history file in *Ichihara* (see *Ichihara*, col. 8, lines 9-11). As amended, however, claim 1 requires that the replacement take place "such that [the] user is disabled from logging on to [the] database." In the process disclosed by *Ichihara*, the terminal and the server synchronize the new password so that the user *will* be able to log on in the future (see *Ichihara*, col. 7, lines 44-63 & col. 8, lines 26-54).

Arlein fails to remedy this deficiency in the teaching of *Ichihara*. *Arlein* does not disclose "replacing [a] stored new password hash value with [a] new password hash value such that [a] user is disabled from logging on to [a] database." Therefore, even if one were to combine *Arlein* and *Ichihara*, the result would still fail to disclose the limitations of amended claim 1.

Independent claim 6, as amended, requires "replacing means for replacing said stored hash value with said new hash value for each triggered calculation, such that said user is disabled from logging on to said database." It is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant : Ulf Mattsson
Serial No. : 09/725,005
Filed : November 29, 2000
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 17299-007001


The remaining claims are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

The fact that the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes any positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicant has asserted certain grounds for the patentability of a claim does not mean that there are not other good grounds for patentability of that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a \$450 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/1/05



Thomas A. Brown
Reg. No. 54,619

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906